

### **REMARKS**

This is in response to the Office Action mailed on January 22, 2004, and the references cited therewith.

Claims 1, 7, 14, 15, 18, 21, and 25 are amended, no claims are canceled, and no claims are added; as a result, claims 1-30 remain pending in this application.

#### **§102 Rejection of the Claims**

Claims 1-7, 9-11, 13, and 21-27 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kubota (U.S. Pat. No. 6,257,897). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection for at least the following reasons.

The prior rejection referred to in the present rejection states that, “Kubota discloses (fig. 4) a wiring system comprising a flexible guide (34, 35, 44) adapted for connection between a first device (fig. 8, item 50) and a second device (not shown) wherein the flexible guide limits communication line movement to substantially a two dimensional plane.”

Kubota appears to show a first support plate 34, a second support plate 35 and a terminal fixing plate 44 with hinges 37<sub>1</sub> and 37<sub>2</sub>. Applicant respectfully maintains that the multiple element design in Kubota is not limited to substantially a two dimensional plane. Column 6, lines 6-10 indicate that the hinges 37<sub>1</sub> and 37<sub>2</sub> should be dimensioned to be bent, folded, or twisted relative to each other. Kubota also appears to show flanges 46 and 46' of connector 40 that “lock” in position using detents 18 (col. 7, lines 47-49). Kubota does not show a flexible guide that is movable in any range of motion after “locking” as taught by Kubota.

In contrast, claims 1 and 7 as amended include a flexible guide wherein the flexible guide is movable in a range of motion, including a position where the communication line can be accessed at a back side of the second device. Further in contrast, claims 14 and 25 as amended include a flexible guide wherein the flexible guide is movable in a range of motion, including a position where the communication line can be accessed at a back side of the display unit. Further in contrast, claim 21 includes operations of extending the flexible guide during a connecting operation with the display unit, and retracting the flexible guide to a position where the display unit is to be mounted.

Because Kubota does not show every element of Applicant's independent claims, a 35 USC § 102(b) rejection is not supported. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested with respect to Applicant's independent claims 1, 7, 21, and 25. Additionally, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested with respect to the remaining claims that depend therefrom as depending on allowable base claims.

§103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 8, 12, 14, 18-20, and 23 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kubota (U.S. Pat. No. 6,257,897) in view of Cronin (U.S. 4,493,146). Claims 28-30 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kubota (U.S. Pat. No. 6,257,897) in view of O'Quinn (U.S. 4,736,910).


The rejection states that "Kubota teaches a flexible guide (fig. 4) which would allow connection of a display unit and movement of the display unit from a first location adjacent the module to a second location apart from the module in order to facilitate connection of the wiring to the display unit." Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the reasons argued above under 35 USC § 102.

In contrast to Kubota as argued above, claim 28 includes a display unit wherein the display unit is movable from a first location adjacent to the avionic module, to a second location spaced apart from the avionic module with the communication line attached.

Applicant respectfully submits that the additional references of Cronin and O'Quinn fail to cure the deficiencies of Kubota as outlined above. Because the cited references, either alone or in combination, do not show every element of Applicant's independent claims, a 35 USC § 103(a) rejection is not supported by the references. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested with respect to claims 8, 12, 14, 18-20, 23 and 28-30.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 15-17 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant has rewritten claim 15 in independent form as



AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE UNDER 37 CFR § 1.116  
Serial Number: 10/086590  
Filing Date: February 28, 2002  
Title: RETRACTABLE PANEL INTERFACE CABLE DEVICE AND METHOD

Page 9  
Dkt: 1528.031US1

suggested by the Examiner. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 15-17 are now in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance, and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney at (612) 373-6944 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.


Respectfully submitted,

BRIAN F. RUFF ET AL.

By their Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.  
P.O. Box 2938  
Minneapolis, MN 55402  
(612) 373-6944


Date 4-22-04

By   
David C. Peterson  
Reg. No. 47,857

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 22nd day of April, 2004.

PATRICIA A. HULTMAN

Name



Signature